

rejections of claims 22-28 as being obvious over Homma '713 in view of Homma '107, which is respectfully traversed.

On page 2, lines 3 and 2, from the bottom of the Action, the Examiner states that "Homma '107 clearly discloses the creation of a prepreg impregnated with a resin having a cover factor of 95-100% (claim 1)." During the first telephone conversation with the Examiner, the undersigned told the Examiner that his understanding of Homma '107 is incorrect. Homma '107 discloses a cover factor of "in a range of 95 to 100%" of a woven fabric, *not* of a prepreg made from the woven fabric of Homma '107. The Examiner was requested to refer to paragraph 8 of Mr. Nishimura's Declaration, which clearly states "the prepreg from the woven fabric of Homma '107 [made by a wet process (see paragraph 5 of Mr. Nishimura's Declaration)] has a cover factor of 75% while the prepreg of this invention [made by the *same* process] has a cover factor of 97%." Table 2 of Mr. Nishimura's Declaration shows that the woven fabric of Homma '107 has a cover factor of 100% but the prepreg from this woven fabric has a cover factor of 75% only. Please note that the amendment of claim 22 that the cloth prepreg is "made by a wet process" does not raise new issues. Instead, it simply clarifies what has been stated in the specification and in paragraph 5 of Mr. Nishimura's Declaration that a "typical wet process ... was used for manufacturing a prepreg from the woven fabric of Homma '107 and a prepreg of this invention."

During the first conversation, the Examiner said that he would review the file and discuss Mr. Nishimura's Declaration with his Supervisor. Subsequently, the Examiner called the undersigned on June 19, 2000, and stated that he was incorrectly interpreting Homma '107. He said that Mr. Nishimura's declaration proves that the cover factor of the *prepreg* of Homma '107 is 75%, *not* 95-100% as he stated in the Action. He said that applicants should submit the above explanation in the next response.

In light of the above, a Notice of Allowance is kindly solicited.


In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent & Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions

for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Assistant Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952**, referencing 360842003400. However, the Assistant Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: June 21, 2000

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____


Raj S. Davé, Ph.D., J.D.
Registration No. 42,465

Morrison & Foerster LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1888
Telephone: (202) 887-8798
Facsimile: (202) 887-0763

RECEIVED
JUN 23 2000
TC 1100 MAIL ROOM